DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 368 CE 017 093

AUTHOR Slettehaugh, Sharon A.
TITLE A Study of Comprehensive Adult Education Directories.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 92p.; Masters paper, University of Minnesota

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Adult Education; *Adult Education Programs; Adult Educators; Adult Students; Continuous Learning; Costs; Data Collection; *Directories; *Educational Opportunities; Evaluation Methods; Financial Support; *Information Dissemination; Information Networks; *Material Development; Objectives; Program Descriptions; Publicize; Staff Utilization

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to identify communities which had developed directories of adult learning opportunities and to describe how and why these directories were developed. Through questionnaires and interviews, data was collected from the developers of twelve comprehensive community directories. Information was obtained on the product's (1) name, developer, area and population served, and listings of learning opportunities; (2) purpose, source, and help to learner; (3) funding, source, production number, costs, and charges; and (4) distribution points. It was concluded that the most useful directories dealt with a limited geographic area, and that agency and volunteer cooperation make it possible to develop and distribute directories with little funding. In the directory development process findings focused on need recognition, funding, staffing, data collection, dissemination, and access. Time taken to develop directories, methods of publicity, and procedures for evaluation were also studied. Libraries, colleges/universities, and adult education associations were found to be the directory developers, and government grants provided an important funding source. It generally took six to nine months to produce a directory. The most common access methods found were telephone information and referral services. Frequently mentioned problems included ill-defined purposes and users and poor agency cooperation. (CSS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159368

A STUDY OF COMPREHENSIVE ADULT EDUCATION DIRECTORIES

A PLAN B PAPER

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

SHARON A. SLETTEHAUGH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

CE017093

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sharon A. Slettehaugh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MAY, 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

Acknowledgement

List of Tables

1 Introduction....1
Problem....1
Purpose....4
Background....5
Methodology....11
Limitations....13
Organization of Paper....14

2 Findings--The Product....15
Geographic Area and Population Served....15
Purposes of the Directories....19
Comparisons of Directories Developed For Helpers and For Users....22
Area Served....23
Distribution....24
Services....24
Publicity....27
Source and Amount of Financing....27
Problems....30
Conclusions....32
Implications and Recommendations....34

3 Findings-- The Process....36
Recognition of Need and Developer....36
Initial Funding....41
Staffing....43
Procedures for Collecting Data....46
Dissemination and Access....48
Evaluation....51
Problems....53
Conclusions....55
Recommendations and Implications....58

4 Summary....60

Appendix A--Cover Letter, Questionnaire and Telephone Questions....65

Appendix B-- Letter from the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research....74

Appendix C--List of Directories with Questionnaire Respondents and Interviewee....76

Bibliography....79

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people deserve thanks for their contributions to this study. Special appreciation is owed to Dr. Harlan Copeland who planted the idea for this study and has so patiently supported its development. The cooperation of all those who responded by telephone and through the questionnaire is greatly appreciated. The special help and concern expressed by Dr. Schultz was very encouraging and his continuing interest in this study was very helpful. Appreciation is also expressed to Sandra Bloom for her patient help.

LIST OF TABLES

Page

I. Name, Location and Developer of Twelve Comprehensive Adult Education Directories with Area and Population Served.....16,17

II. Purpose of Twelve Comprehensive Adult Education Directories, Recognition of Need and Attendant Services.....21

III. Initial Funding Source, Number Produced, Cost of Production and Charges for Twelve Comprehensive Adult Education Directories.....25

IV. Agencies and Organization to Whom Directories Were Distributed.....26

V. Estimated Time Requirements for the Development of a Comprehensive Adult Education Directory.....45

VI. Methods of Publicizing the Project and Frequency of Publicity.....50

VII. Number of Projects Conducting An Evaluation of Directories.....52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem

Adults are active learners. Allen Tough has found that:

> Almost everyone undertakes at least one or two major learning efforts a year, and some individuals undertake as many as 15 or 20. The median is eight learning projects a year, involving eight distinct areas of knowledge and skill.
>
> A learning project is simply a major, highly deliberate effort to gain certain knowledge and skill (or to change in some other way). Some learning projects are efforts to gain new knowledge, insight, or understanding. Others are attempts to improve one's skill or performance, or to change one's attitudes or emotional reactions. Others involve efforts to change one's overt behavior or to break a habit.
>
> It is common for a man or woman to spend 700 hours a year at learning projects. Some persons spend less than 100 hours, but others spend more than 2,000 hours in episodes in which the person's intent to learn or change is clearly his primary motivation.[1]

The idea that learning ends with formal education is certainly destroyed by these data. The motivations for adult learning vary, from making something useful, increasing job skills or acquiring credits for a degree or certificate, to satisfying curiosity, following an interest,

---

[1] Allen Tough, The Adult's Learning Projects, (Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971), p. 1.

or for pure enjoyment.[2]

Interestingly, Tough found that about 70% of all learning projects were planned by the learner using a variety of resources. The learner in most cases must seek out learning opportunities and try to determine which best fits her/his needs. This can be a difficult process if the learner is not aware of community resources, or if there are large numbers of such resources to investigate. The learner's job could be much easier if a directory of learning opportunities was available. Then the learner could check all programs under a particular subject and make an informed and productive decision.

There are other people who need information on a variety of programs. Counselors, social workers, and other helpers of adults may also function with limited information. Usually these people are aware of some community agencies and programs. However, if they could have a complete listing of learning opportunities, they could better meet the adult client's needs.

Both the learner and the adult helper could benefit from a directory of learning opportunities. It could save both time and energy and result in a more agreeable match between individual and program.

Because of the variety of organizations offering learning opportunities (as can be seen in any one of the directories mentioned here), institutions may be competing with one another. A means for these institutions to publicize their programs to a wide public may attract individuals not now participating in learning programs. Thus, a directory could also provide a forum for institutions or agencies to

---

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

publicize their programs so they could be more fully utilized.

Since a directory has been found useful for learners, helpers, and institutions many communities have decided to develop such a service. However, there is no literature available as to what steps to take to get started, what to include, how long it would take to develop such a resource, and what it might cost. When this research project was begun, there was no list of communities that had developed such a directory, so that those who acquired experience by actually producing a directory could be contacted to help the beginner. Those who have developed directories have often done them under a special grant which did not supply funds for documentation, or they were done as a part of a limited project along with a regular job, so time and money for reporting were not available.

Because the field of adult education is fairly new, and self-directed learning even more recently recognized, there was no research available on directories of adult learning opportunities, and specifically how they were developed. There was literature available on institutions which offer programs for a particular audience, such as older Americans, but no information was found on the process of developing a printed directory. The six related items located through the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) system[4] were complete copies of directories available in print. There were listings available of particular types of programs such as The Weekend Education Source Book.[5] The National

---

[4]ERIC is an education data base maintained by the U.S. National Institute of Education. It contains citations of unpublished research reports and of journal articles; it is updated monthly.

[5]Wilbur Cross, The Weekend Education Source Book, (New York: Harper's Magazine Press, 1976).

Center for Educational Brokering's book--Educational Brokering, A New Service For AdultLearners,[6] published in 1976, dealt with the same kinds of questions included in the questionnaire for this study but did not deal with printed directories. A study was done at Colorado State University of two types of adult education programs listed in their catalogs,[7] but this was a look at programs not the process of developing a directory itself. A lack of information exists about comprehensive directories of adult education opportunities and the processes involved in developing them.

Purpose

The general purposes of this study were:

(1) to identify communities which had developed directories of adult learning opportunities.

(2) to describe how and why these directories were developed.

Specifically, the study sought answers to questions such as:

What communities have developed comprehensive adult education directories?

Did directories include opportunities from a variety of institutions or programs or from a single institution?

Who developed these directories?

What were their purposes?

How were they funded?

How much did they cost?

How were the directories developed?

---

[6] James M. Heffernan and others, Educational Brokering, A New Service for Adult Learners, (New York: National Center for Educational Brokering, 1976).

[7] Douglas Sjogren and other, Effective A.B.E. Programming: Nine Case Studies, (Colorado: Colorado State University, 1976).

What information was included?

How long did it take to develop a comprehensive directory?

How were the directories distributed and publicized?

How were they evaluated?

What problems did the developers encounter?

What insights did they gain?

Background

Adults are taking advantage of more education opportunities in a wide variety of settings. A study done by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1972 surveyed education offered by various types of community organizations.[8] The results showed that people of all ages, sexes, and ethnic backgrounds were participating in educational programs sponsored by a wide variety of education, voluntary, civic, social service and cultural organizations in the community.

If a city has only one college, one community school and one social service agency, it would be fairly simple to determine where a learner should go to seek information. However, as more organizations and institutions offer educational opportunities, the learner has more choices and is interested in picking the opportunity that best meets her/his needs or fits her/his philosophy. However, finding all of those opportunities can be a vary time consuming task, and she/he may settle for an inappropriate program due to lack of information on the available

---

[8] Evelyn Kay, Adult Education in Community Organizations, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. GOvernment Printing Office, 1974).

offerings.

In Toronto it was found that:

> ...A state of information starvation exists in our society for those with the least power. "Information starvation" appears to be a phenomenon of critical dimension in the view of many educators, community development workers, and other agents of change in the society. The citizen's right to information has become eroded by a variety of factors, including the explosion of information and the lack of adequate systems for the storage and retrieval of pertinent and relevant information. Our political and governmental system must now develop effective strategies for rationalizing attempts to solve this crisis. The growth of a series of data banks, containing data and information to serve high priority needs of citizens and decision-makers, could alleviate "information starvation" to a marked extent.[9]

Thorough counseling of adults requires an information resource, such as a directory, so the individual can be informed of the total variety of opportunities.

> The better the collection of information, the easier its accessibility, the higher the quality of counselling (sic) available to citizens. The benefits of effective information use include:
>
> - .more efficient and easier access to pertinent information for the citizen
> - .more comprehensive and up-to-date information about adult education in Toronto for libraries, counsellors, and administrators
> - .statistical data relating to the extent, range and character of adult education provision in this area for researchers and program planners
> - .a precise tool with which administrators can analyze course provision, including gaps and duplication, geographic distribution, regional quality, correlations (e.g., fees and teaching hours), and other valuable data.
>
> Adult education agencies will be able to engage more effectively in co-operative program planning, possibly adopting common data collection and reporting procedures. Other communities will see how information management in action does improve the adult education enterprise.[10]

---

[9] Continuing Education in Action--Toronto's Computer- Based Data Bank Serves Wide Public, (Toronto: MetroDOC, 1970). p. 1.

[10] Ibid., p. 6.

The benefits of an information resource are widespread and affect the whole community.

The concept of education brokering was developed to provide a linkage between these benefits and educational needs of adult learners. Brokering is a process of providing information to adults about learning opportunities from a variety of sources. This allows the learner to view all available opportunities and to decide which program fits her/his needs best. Unlike most services which are related to a specific institution of learning and which promote programs associated with that particular institution, brokering focuses on the individual, and she/he is provided information about a wide variety of educational and career opportunities. Brokering was designed to meet the needs of the adult student, not the institution.[11]

This kind of service can be provided in many ways. For example, a telephone information and referral service exists in Evanston, Illinois. This service is provided on an individual basis for a particular area of interest. An individual interested in a particular topic, to teach or to learn, contacts the Learning Exchange. This information is filed and others seeking to learn or to teach that subject will be referred. The individual adult must make the contact and set up a time with the learner or teacher.[12]

However, the Center for Educational Brokering characterized many adults as dependent upon others for informational services. Few clients were found to be self-starters.[13] These adults could not readily

---

[11] Heffernan, p. 2

[12] S. Croteau, "You Call Us, They'll Call you: Learning Exchange", Education Digest, April, 1977, p. 16-18.

[13] Heffernan, p. 19.

benefit from a system, such as the Learning Exchange, which requires substantial initiative on the part of the adult.

A printed directory, which provides all the detailed information about a learning opportunity could very well meet the needs of those who do not tend to be self-starters by putting a large amount of information at their fingertips. The Metropolitan Toronto Library Board produces a Continuing Education Directory[14] which is computerized and is updated bi-annually. This type of resource could be very useful for both learners and helpers.

However, trying to determine how existing printed directories were developed is difficult. There were several articles available on the Learning Exchange,[15] and a monograph has been published describing how to set up such a system.[16] The previsouly cited publication, by the National Center for Educational Brokering, deals with the concerns and process of developing a brokering service but not specifically with

---

[14] Continuing Education Directory, (Toronto: Metropolitan Toronto Library Board, 1969 and 1973).

[15] Terry Brown, "In Chicago, It's Easy to Find Someone to Teach Lion Taming or Anything Else", The WAll Street Journal, April 10, 1973;
S. Croteau, pp. 16-18;
Dennis Fisher, "How Learning Exchange Works and at $27 for 6 Months", Chicago Sun Times, November 9, 1971;
James Roper, "Three Ways to Get Something Done," Reader's Digest, August, 1972, p. 39;
Gary Wisby, "The Learning Exchange--Matching Students to Teachers," Chicago Sunday Sun-Times, November 30, 1975;
"A Fair Exchange", Time, April 18, 1975, p. 64; and
"The People-To-People System", Psychology Today, February, 1975.

[16] Robert G. Lewis and other, The Learning Exchange, (Illinois: The Learning Exchange, 1977).

how a printed comprehensive directory could be produced in a community.

Toronto has developed a comprehensive directory. A mimeographed publication on the Toronto project described the three phases of its project: production of experimental directory, analysis and evaluation of the directory and development of a data bank.[17] It explained the rationale and benefits. It did not include details such as cost, time and type of publicity used, which would be necessary for someone developing a directory.

The Regional Learning Service in New York (RLS) is another brokering service that attempts to meet the information and counseling needs of adults.[18] Unlike the Learning Exchange, it focuses on institutional programs, providing a counseling and brokering service to potential students.

Documents such as the one produced by the Illinois Office of Education listed descriptions of demonstration projects funded under the Adult Education Act.[19] Some of those projects included counseling and referral services, but did not produce printed directories or study them.

While Adult Leadership contained articles on adult education programming,[20] marketing,[21] and telephone systems,[22] development of

---

[17] Continuing Education in Action...pp. 2-3.

[18] "What Is the Next Thing I Want To Do With My Life?", Carnegie Quarterly, Spring, 1977, pp. 3-5.

[19] Illinois Office of Education, Abstracts of Special Demonstration 309 Projects, (Springfield: Adult and Continuing Education Section, 1977).

[20] Joseph Newlin, "Communi-Link, A Unique Approach Toward Adult Education Programming," Adult Leadership, Fall, 1973, pp. 263-4.

[21] Stanley Grabowski, "ERIC--Role of the Computer in Adult Education", Adult Leadership, November, 1972, p. 178.

[22] Phyllis Byrd, "Dial Systems Initiated in Virginia", Adult Leadership, October, 1972, pp. 122-3.

directories was not a topic. As part of a cooperative project between the library and community college described in Community and Junior College Journal, a file of learning opportunities in the area was developed.[23] Again, no printed directory was produced.

None of these sources, then, described the process of developing a printed directory. Three items located in the ERIC system were microfiche reprints of directories acquired through the search for this study.[24] Three other items were copies of directories covering a single institution, such as a community college or public school, or directed to a specific audience, such as older citizens.[25]

Because the literature search revealed no information on the process of developing a directory, the background for this study was limited, and what information was obtained was provided by those who have directories.

---

[23] Paul Little and Richard Gilliland, "OASES: Public Library Community College Partnership," Community and Junior College Journal, October, 1977, pp. 14-15.

[24] Douglas Sjogren and Larry Jacobson, Cataloging Adult Education Programs in Region VIII and In-Depth Study of Selected Exemplar Programs. (Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1976);

Regional Learning Service of Central New York, Directory of Adult and Continuing Education Agencies, Metropolitan Syracuse, 1975-76, (Syracuse: Regional Learning Service of Central New York, 1975); and

Mary M. Carmichael, ed., A Guide to Learning Opportunities for Adults: Directory of Continuing Education in Central New York, (Ithica: Cornell Universi , 1976).

[25] American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Older Americans and Community Colleges: An Overview, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974);

New York State Education Department, Directory of Public School Continuing Education Programs in New York State, (New York: New York State Education Department, 1975); and

Maryland Council for Higher Education, State Directory of Public and Private Post-Secondary Education Institutions and Agencies in Maryland, (Annapolis: Maryland Council for Higher Education, 1974).

Methodology

The first step was to identify where directories had been developed. Personal contacts with adult educators attending the Adult Education Research Conference in 1977 revealed some directories. Alexander Charters[26] was familiar with A Guide to Learning Opportunities for Adults from Syracuse, New York.[27] Allen Moore felt there were few available and suggested an ERIC search.[28] Eldon Schultz suggested that adult education directors for each state be contacted.[29] James Roth supplied Abstracts of Special Demonstration 309 Projects[30] but was not aware of specific directories.[31]

David Smith and Margaret Gillespie, of the Hennepin County Library System, provided information about their efforts to secure funding for a "Continuing Education Indexing and Referral Service" project in 1976. They supplied a copy of the proposal and suggested the American Library Association as a contact.[32]

---

[26]Interview with Alexander Charters, Professor, Adult Education, Syracuse University, Minneapolis, April, 1977.

[27]Carmichael.

[28]Interview with Allen Moore, ERIC Clearinghouse on Career Education, Minneapolis, April, 1977.

[29]Interview with Eldon Schultz, Branch Chief, Adult Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Minneapolis, April, 1977.

[30]Illinois Office of Education.

[31]Interview with James Roth, Adult and Continuing Education Section, Illinois State Board of Education, Minneapolis, April, 1977.

[32]Interview with David Smith and Margaret Gillespie, Hennepin County Library, Minneapolis, April, 1977.

The Adult Education Association; the National Association for Public Continuing Adult Education; the National Advisory Council on Adult Education; the American Library Association; the Director of the Division of Adult Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and ADVANCE Through Adult Education in Pennsylvania were other sources contacted. Five directories resulted from these contacts.

Also, each adult education director in each state was asked to provide information about community directories of adult learning opportunities in his state which were not specific to one group of institutions.

An ERIC search produced the six directories already mentioned. A literature search produced no directories per se, although reference was often made to the Learning Exchange in Evanston, Illinois (See p.7).

The total number of directories located was twenty-three. Ten were judged to be inappropriate because they were limited to one audience, or they provided information about only one institution's offerings, or they were restricted to one subject-matter area. Thirteen directories were considered to be comprehensive community directories andbecame the focus of this study.

A questionnaire was developed asking for information about purposes, process, services and funding of the directories. (A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A). The respondents were asked in the questionnaire if they would be available for a telephone interview at a later date.

Content of the questionnaire was determined. A list of questions to be asked in the interview was developed by outlining the information a developer would need as to what, who, how, when, where and why. The questionnaire was revised and refined after being reviewed

for clarity and face validity. It was submitted, along with a sample cover letter and list of telephone questions, to the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research. (The letter conveying committee approval of the instruments is included in Appendix B.)

After the thirteen completed questionnaires were returned and reviewed, twelve interviews were conducted between August and September, 1978. (One directory was no longer in production, and the organization that sponsored it had disbanded.) The content of the interviews was based on any unresolved items from the questionnaire and the telephone interview schedule.

The data were analyzed to determine similarities and differences among directories based on the purpose, type of community, intended user, inclusion of credit or non-credit courses, and attendant services.

Limitations

A cautionary note is required, however. Only twelve community directories were studied. They were selected from twenty-three proposals because they represented community-wide learning opportunities provided by more than one institution for more than one audience. There were probably community directories that were not uncovered. Another limitation with the study is that the directories were not all developed in the same year; the earliest was published in 1974 and the latest in 1977. Some were funded for only one year and were never updated. Thus, the costs for developing the directories are not directly comparable because of inflation. Little data on users were available so questions related to this issue cannot be answered with any accuracy. Information and referral services, which are becoming popular, were not studied

since the main purpose of this project was to look at printed directories.

Organization of Paper

The paper is organized into four sections. The first is an introduction to the problem and the procedures of the study. The next section deals with the findings about the directory. The third section is concerned with the findings about the process of developing a directory. The second and third sections both contain a discussion of problems, conclusions and recommendations. Finally, there is a summary of the study followed by a bibliography and appendices.

CHAPTER II

FINDINGS--THE PRODUCT

To gain an understanding of the nature of comprehensive community adult education directories, it was important to look at the geographic area served, the purposes of the directories, the intended user(s), the format, the content, the methods of financing and any attendant services. Each component will be described; conclusions, implications and recommendations are presented at the end of this chapter.

Geographic Area and Population Served

The twelve directories included in this study come from a wide range of communities-- from state-wide to a single city.[33] Table I includes a listing of the twelve directories and a description of the area and population served.

State

Two state-wide directories have been developed--in Kansas and Colorado. Kansas State University and the University of Kansas developed the Kansas Informal Learning Directory which lists only non-credit, informal learning opportunities for the whole state. It was developed as a data base for the information and referral (I & R) service, FIRST LINE,

---

[33] The twelve directories studied are listed in Appendix C. They are also listed in the bibliography.

TABLE I

NAME, LOCATION, AND DEVELOPER OF TWELVE COMPREHENSIVE ADULT EDUCATION DIRECTORIES WITH AREA AND POPULATION SERVED.

Refer ence Name	Full Name	Developer	Geographic Region	Population	Type of Learning Opportunities Listed
Kansas State	The Kansas Informal Learning Directory	Kansas State University	State	2,500,000	Non-credit
Colorado	Catalog of Adult Education Programs	Colorado State Univ.	State	4,000,000 (6 directories)	Both--credit and non-credit
Cornell	Directory of Continuing Educ. in Central N.Y. State	Cornell University	Region	1,300,000	Both
RAC	Educational Services Directory	Rochester Area Colleges	Region	500,000	Both
DACE	DACE Round-Up Of Courses	Dutchess Asso. For Cont. Educ.	Region	225,000	Both
Ohio	Directory of Adult Education Programs in Central Ohio	Central Ohio Adult Education Association	Region	***	Both
CIRCLE	Educational Opportunities	Community Infor. & Resource Center for Lifelong Education	Metropolitan area	1,250,000	Both
Houston	Learning How	Houston Public Lib.	Metropolitan area	2,000,000	Non-credit
RLS	Directory of Cont. Educ. Opportunities in N.Y. City	Regional Learning Service	Metropolitan area	250,000	Both
Toronto	Continuing Education Directory	Toronto, Ontario Public Library	Metropolitan area	2,200,000	Both

(CONTINUED)

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

Reference Name	Full Name	Developer	Geographic Region	Population	Type of Learning Opportunities Listed
Washington, D.C.	For Adults Only!	Washington, D.C. Public Schools	Metropolitan area	700,000	Both
Wichita	Wichita Informal Learning Directory	Kansas State University	Metropolitan area	300,000	Non-credit

*** Information not available

and serves a state populatin of about 2½ million. Another state-wide directory was developed by Colorado State University. This involved a region-wide effort to document learning opportunities in each of the six states in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Region VIII. The total population served was approximately four million.

Regional

Four regional directories had been developed at the time of this study. In the state of New York, two regional directories were produced. A Guide to Learning Opportunities for Adults: Directory of Continuing Education in Central New York was a regional directory of credit and non-credit learning opportunities developed by Cornell University for eleven counties with approximately 1,300,000 total population. The Educational Services Directory 1974-75 produced by the Rochester Area Colleges (RAC), was similar to the Cornell directory in that it was developed for one of the eight regions of New York State with a population of approximately 500,000.

Another regional directory was the Directory of Adult Education Programs in Central Ohio. This directory of credit and non-credit opportunities was developed by the Central Ohio Adult Education Association. The Dutchess Association for Continuing Education (DACE) in New York produces a publication and computer print-out for only one county serving approximately 225,000 people.

Metropolitan

Six metropolitan directories were located in this study. Educational Opportunities was produced by Community Information and Resource Center for Lifelong Education (CIRCLE) in Denver. It serves about 1¼ million people. Learning How: A Guide to Leisure Classes

In The Houston Area was developed by three Houston libraries and serves a population of approximately 2 million. The Regional Learning Service (RLS) in Syracuse, New York developed a Directory of Adult and Continuing Education Agencies 1975-6 serving approximately 250,000 people. The best known directory, Metrodoc or Continuing Education Directory, was produced by the Metropolitan Toronto Library Board. It serves 2,200,000 people.

For Adults Only! was developed for Washington, D.C. and served a population of 700,000. Wichita Informal Learning Directory was developed in Kansas to provide further information for the FIRST LINE service related to the Kansas State Project. The Wichita population was about 300,000.

Of these six directories Wichita and Houston provided information on only non-credit opportunities, the others listed both.

Of the twelve directories, two were developed to serve the residents of an entire state, four were for a region within a state, and six were for residents of a metropolitan area. The population served ranged from four million (the six states in Region VIII) to 225,000 (Dutchess County, New York).

Purposes of the Directories

These directories were developed by a variety of institutions in many different settings both as independent efforts and as part of a larger project. However, the purposes of the directory seemed to fall into two categories depending upon who the intended user was. One category included purposes such as:

(1) providing a resource for those working with adults;

(2) providing an information resource to professional people

advising adult learners, and

(3) providing an information resource for agency personnel planning adult education programs.

Help in recruitment for adult education and fulfilling the stated purpose of an agency were other purposes listed in this category. This category was concerned with serving adults indirectly through services to agencies and professional staff members.

Direct service to adults was the other category and included purposes such as:

(1) providing an information resource for adult learners,

(2) promoting the idea of lifelong learning,

(3) developing public understanding of the scope of education opportunities for adults.

Six directories were developed primarily for helpers of adults: Cornell, Rochester Area Colleges (RAC), Colorado and Kansas and the Regional Learning Service (RLS). (See Table II, p. 21.) The states purpose of the DACE publication was for helpers, although they also sent out a newspaper-type directory to every home in the county. Two directories, produced in Wichita and Houston, were developed mainly for the adult learner population according to their stated purpose. The four directories produced by Toronto, CIRCLE, Washington, D.C., and Ohio were developed with both users in mind. CIRCLE emphasized the promotion of lifelong learning. The Washington, D.C. directory had both audiences in mind and also used the directory as public relations for the sponsoring organization.

It is interesting to note that directories developed for helpers

TABLE II

PURPOSE OF TWELVE COMPREHENSIVE ADULT EDUCATION DIRECTORIES, RECOGNITION OF NEED AND ATTENDANT SERVICES

Reference Name	Purpose of Directory	Who Recognized the Need For A Directory	What Kind of Help Was Offered To The Learner
Kansas	For Helper	College or University	Information and Referral
Colorado	For Helper	College or University	None
Cornell	For Helper	College or University	Trainers For Users
RAC (Rochester Area Colleges)	For Helper	College or University	None
DACE (Dutchess Asso. for Cont. Education)	For Helper	Adult Education Association	None
Ohio	For Both Helper and Learner	Adult Education Association	Information and Referral Counseling
CIRCLE (Comm. Info. & Resource Center for Lifelong Educ.)	For Both	Adult Education Association	Trainers for Users Information and Referral Clearinghouse
Houston	For Learner	Library	Information and Referral*
RLS (Regional Learning Service)	For Helper	College or University/ Adult Education Association	Information and Referral
Toronto	For Both	Library	Information and Referral*
Washington, D.C.	For Both	Government Agency	None
Wichita	For Learner	College or University	Information and Referral**

*Part of regular library function, not specifically to go with the directory.

**FIRST LINE system, same as Kansas State.

were produced by colleges or adult education services which received help from a college. The two libraries represented, Houston and Toronto, developed directories mainly for users.

Comparison of Directories Developed For Helpers and For Users

Keeping the general purposes in mind, we can compare the format, area served, distribution, services, publicity and financing to see if these vary according to the intended user.

Format

Looking first at format and inclusiveness of data, the content of the directories done for helpers was arranged in alphabetical order according to the institution or organization offering the opportunity. There was usually a subject index as well, for example, Home Economics or Computers. A contact person was usually identified and an address and/or telephone number given. A brief description of the various offerings of each institution was usually included along with fee charged. Specific courses and times were not listed. The RAC directory also listed the faculty, enrollment, and services, such as counseling.

The directories developed by Colorado were clearly not intended for the public. They were difficult to use and were reprints of a computer printout. They lacked eye-appeal. Content areas were listed by numbers. The reader would have to refer to another index to find out what the content actually was.

Interestingly, the two directories developed for use by adults appeared to be done in a low-budget format. They were smaller and stapled together. Both were done for metropolitan areas. The Houston directory listed institutions or individuals and their programs. It included

time, fee and whom to contact. It also had a subject listing and only the name of the center offering that course and the page to find the description. The Wichita directory was organized into seven categories. Name and address of offering institution, contact person and title of offerings were included. Both of these directories dealt with leisure or non-credit learning opportunities exclusively.

The directories developed for both users varied a great deal--from a poster format (with a quantity of information crammed into a small area) to computer printout. Specific times and places for course offerings under subject headings were provided. Reading the poster format would be difficult. The Toronto and D.C. directories were very inclusive, giving specific courses, places, times and costs. The Toronto directory was also a computer printout but the clearness of content compensates for its lack of eye appeal. The D.C. directory was especially useful. First, it had a listing of courses alphabetically, giving pages where they could be found in the body of the directory. This listing also provided time of day, and the part of the city where the course was offered. A second chart listed an index of programs alphabetically, with emphasis and type of agency, whether government or social welfare, checked. The course descriptions included emphasis, requirements and sponsoring agencies.

Area Served

Of the directories developed for helpers two were state-wide, three were regions within a state, and one was metropolitan. The two for learners dealt with metropolitan areas. Of those developed for both users, one was regional. The other three covered metropolitan areas. (See Tables I and II, pages 16 and 21).

Distribution

The two directories for learners were widely distributed. (See Tables III and IV, pp. 25 and 26.) Wichita, with a population of 300,000, distributed 300 copies to every type of institution, except labor unions and conference centers. The Houston directory, serving a two million population, printed 3,000 the first time and 5,000 the second. However, distribution was through schools and libraries, where individuals could pick them up. They found they did not have enough copies in either case.

Directories intended for both types of users were widely distributed to all types of institutions. Most developers printed many copies, unless they were intended for use in one place rather than for personal possession, as in Toronto.

Those directories intended for helpers were generally less comprehensively distributed. They were distributed to institutions and agencies that might do counseling or referral. Fewer copies were usually printed. The smallest printing was 50 and the most was 500.

Services

The developers of the directories were asked about the number and kinds of attendant services provided. Attendant services were defined as procedures which made the directory more useful to the user. They included services such as telephone information and referral, training for those who would use the directory, counseling of adults, or acting as a clearinghouse for community information.

Only three of the six directories for helpers provided any attendant services--information and referral services (2) and training for users (1). Both directories developed for users, and five of the six

TABLE III

INITIAL FUNDING SOURCE, NUMBER PRODUCED, COST OF PRODUCTION AND CHARGES FOR TWELVE COMPREHENSIVE ADULT EDUCATION DIRECTORIES

Reference Name	Purpose	Initial Funding Source	Number Produced	Cost of Production	Charge For Directory
Kansas	Helper	Government Grants	50	$ 8,740	$ 7.50
Colorado	Helper	Government Grants	100(per State)	40,600	None
Cornell	Helper	Government Grants (Pt. of larger Project)	1,000	1,200*	None
RAC (Rochester Area Colleges)	Helper	Government Grants (Pt, of larger Project)	5,000	14,850*	5.00
DACE (Dutchess Ass. For Cont. Educ.)	Helper	Agency Budgets	100(Computer) 85,000(to homes)	300** 7,490	None
Ohio	Both	Agency Budgets	3,000	183**	None
CIRCLE	Both	Agency Budgets	7,000	15,000*	None
Houston	Learner	Agency Budgets	5,000	1,900	None
RLS (REgional Learning Service)	Helper	Agency Budgets	1,000	2,375	None
Toronto	Both	Government Grant (Prov.)	700	20,500	15.00
Washington, D.C.	Both	Government Grant	15,000	40,322	None
Wichita	Learner	Agency Budget	300	670	None

*Part of a larger project--data very rough estimate

**Much donated labor or computer time.

TABLE IV

AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS TO WHOM DIRECTORIES WERE DISTRIBUTED

Recipients of Directories	Projects (out of 12) Sending Directories To Each Recipient
Libraries	12
Schools, colleges and universities	12
Cooperative extension services	10
Voluntary agencies	9
Government	8
Health and welfare agencies	8
Business and Industry	8
Recreation agencies	8
Professional groups	6
Religious institutions	6
Media	6
Museums and galleries	5
Senior citizen centers and programs	5
Labor unions	4
Conference centers	3

directories developed for both, provided assistance to potential users. (See Table II, p. 21.) This may reflect a greater concern for access by the non-professional user, or a recognition of the greater need for easy access among learners.

Publicity

The type of publicity used did not show a pattern, except that those intended for helpers were usually not advertised to the general public. Mailing of the directory to those institutions interested or listed was the only means of publicity used in most cases.

Source and Amount of Financing

Four of the six helper-oriented directories were entirely or largely government funded. (See Table III, p. 25). The other two were funded by the agencies that participated in developing the directory. The two done for learners were done by the regular library staff in the case of Houston, and by volunteer graduate students as part of a class in Wichita, so costs were quite low. The four directories developed for both helpers and learners were financed by agency grants (2) and by government grants (2).

A comparison of costs for producing the directories revealed that the Houston and Wichita directories for learners were done with small budgets. (See Table III, p. 25.) The cost of 5,000 directories in Houston was approximately $1,900. This covered salaries ($1,632), printing done by the library ($250), distribution ($11.50), and miscellaneous office costs ($4.20). The Wichita directory costs were $500 in staff time for the instructor who taught the course, $100 for printing, $20 for distribution, and $50 for travel. This resulted in a total of $670. Thus, their appearance does reflect the total dollar investment in these directories.

The other directories varied in the amoung of money spent on their development. Some costs were hard to determine, because the directory was part of another project, or the work was done by people as part of their jobs. A few examples will show the range of expenditures.

Washington, D.C. produced 15,000 copies of its directory for $28,322 and $12,000 for printing. Toronto spent approximately $20,500 updating its catalog; $3,296 in salaries, $7,500 in computer costs, and $9,000 in printing. About 700 directories were produced.

The costs of the RAC catalog (5000 copies) were $9,000 in staff, $2,550 for print ing, $1,000 for facilities, $500 for computer time, $500 for distribution, $800 for publicity, $200 for travel and $300 for office costs. The total was $14,850.

The Kansas directory costs were $7,000 for staff time and the telephone system, $500 for printing, $100 for distribution, $50 for publicity, $1,000 for telephone service and $50 for travel and miscellaneous office expenses. The total cost was $8,740 for 50 copies of the directory plus an information and referral service.

Because the directories vary in comprehensiveness, services and methods of production, a comparison of costs becomes very difficult. The D.C. catalog comes to about $2.60 per copy, which, considering the quality of the directory, seems quite reasonable. The Houston directory was very inexpensive, costing less than 40¢ per copy. However, it included only leisure classes for a metropolitan area and the second edition was developed and printed by the library on newsprint.

The DACE directory only cost about $300 for the 100 computer print-outs which go to agencies. The newsprint directory that was mailed

to every resident in the county totaled about $7,490 for 85,000 copies. Here again, labor was basically donated, as were computer time and printing facilities.

Most directories were distributed at no cost. (See Table III, p.25). The directories produced principally for learners were given to them at no charge. Houston has considered selling their directories in local book stores if funding could be found to print more. Since they found mostly middle and upper class individuals participating in opportunities, they did not feel that cost would be a problem for their users.

Three of the four directories designed for both users were free. The fourth, the Toronto directory, cost $15 per copy, which was approximately one half the cost of production. However, participating agencies received one copy free, so only 200-250 were actually sold.

Of those produced for helpers primarily, four of the six did not charge. The developers of the RAC directory charged $5 for the directory, more than its cost.

In summary, comprehensive directories of adult education were prepared for three groups of users: (1) agency staff or helpers, (2) adult learners, and (3) both helpers and learners. One-half (6) of the directories were developed for helpers, two were developed for users primarily, and four were prepared for both groups.

In general, directories intended for the adult learner to use had more complete and detailed information. Specific times, places and costs were often listed. While these details were not listed in all directories intended for learners, none of those intended for helpers listed specific courses with times, places and costs.

Directories developed primarily for users were financed by agency and volunteer funds and had small budgets. While user oriented, they lacked eye-appeal and were not computerized. The two user-oriented directories were developed for single metropolitan areas, and distributed widely to a variety of institutions in an effort to reach the general adult population. Attendant services to adult learners were available in both systems.

In contrast, directories developed for helpers were financed primarily by government grants--often as part of a larger project. These directories did not include information about specific courses, times, places and costs. They were distributed selectively to participating agencies and to staff on a regional or state level. Attendant services to persons using the directory were provided in three of the six cases. Budgets, while difficult to determine precisely, were considerably larger than the budgets of directories developed for the adult learners.

As might be expected, directories intended for both users showed a combination of features from the other two types. They were funded by government grants and agency budgets, were generally produced in larger numbers but varied greatly in cost. Three of the four offered attendant services and detailed information such as specific courses and times, places and costs.

Problems

Projects of this magnitude inevitably develop problems. Funding for directories was a major problem. Many government and foundation grants were for new projects. Once a directory had been developed, it was difficult to get continued funding to update and to continue producing it.

In the case of the Colorado directories, the states were expected to continue the directory. However, Douglas Sjogren found that the states did not see any particular value to the directory. They found it was too general, since they already had the listed information for their local area and had no use for the statewide information.[34] Therefore, the states did not fund continuation of the project. The regional RAC directory was not updated because the library had a county-by-county project which was more useful than this demonstration project.

Some directories were used as a public information or public relations tools. The D.C. and the Kansas directories were examples where the goal was to help make the public become aware of the wealth of informal learning opportunities available. Each felt the directory was useful even if further funding was not received.

Another frustration was the apparent impossibility of getting information on all opportunities that existed. For example, in the Kansas directory there were 40 listings for Wichita. However, when an intensive search was made in Wichita, 300 opportunities were available and listed in the Wichita directory.

Public awareness of the directory was often a problem too. Those involved with traditional education have access to resources such as the directory and were often aware of opportunities even without such a resource. It was the general public which probably was not aware of the directory and its potential. The same concerns were expressed about the Houston directory. Because there were not enough copies to

---

[34]See Appendix C for the names of those interviewed about each project.

give them to everyone who requested one, it was possible that only the librarians knew about it. Mary Meyers mentioned that even some of the new library staff may not have known about this resource.

Toronto found a need for more publicity and budgeted it for the 1978 issue. Publicity was intentionally limited in D.C., to prevent an overload in the attendant services.

Determining the amount of detail included in the directory information was also a problem. The information in most directories used for helpers was not detailed enough for an information and referral service or for the public who would need to know information about place, date and time. To make the directory that detailed would involve additional costs.

Conclusions

Directories of adult learning opportunities have been successfully developed for a broad range of geographic areas, from a single city to a whole state. However, the usefulness of these directories varies. It seems that the most useful directories deal with a geographic area, within which the adult learner would travel for an opportunity. In fact, directories intended for use by the learner dealt with a smaller geographic area, often metropolitan.

The content was more limited in those directories that went to individual learners. The costs of producing a complete directory, such as Toronto's, for home use would be extensive. Directories for helpers only did not provide specific courses and times. Thus, they would not become outdated so soon, and the helper may be more willing to extend the extra effort to call for details.

Attendant services to insure access and use were very important for those directories that might be used by the learner. Distribution of those directories was wider. Those intended for helpers were distributed primarily to institutions or agencies which provided counseling or referral.

Publicity was usually restricted to the mailing of the directory itself. If it were intended for the helper, it was usually not advertised to the population in general.

The directories done for learners involved small budgets. This raises a question. Are governments and foundations more likely to fund projects that assist agencies and professionals to do their jobs, or projects that reach adults directly? The subject matter of the two user-oriented directories could also have had an influence since these directories dealt only with leisure and non-credit learning. They were two of the three directories which focused entirely on non-credit and leisure learning. All others listed both credit and non-credit learning opportunities. Perhaps it was viewed as a manageable project by the developers, because Wichita and Houston dealt with fairly small geographic areas and limited types of courses. As a result, outside funding may not have been viewed as necessary.

However, there were directories such as DACE and Ohio, intended for both adults and for helpers, that were done on small budgets. Thus, it was possible through cooperation among agencies and donated services to develop and distribute a directory at very low cost.

Staff time and printing were generally the highest costs, along with computer time or a telephone system if either were used. Most

directories were distributed free. If there was a charge it did not usually cover the cost of production.

The usefulness of a directory to the community was a crucial issue in the continued production, as can be seen in the case of the Colorado directories. Finding all the opportunities in a community can also be very difficult.

The intended user was very important to consider when trying to determine how complete the information should be. Learners and persons in information and referral services need more detailed information than professional helpers who would probably be more willing to seek out the needed information.

Implications and Recommendations

The intended user should be considered in every step of the development--purpose, format, geographic area, distribution, services, publicity and financing. The information provided should meet the needs of this user and duplication must be avoided. The most appropriate geographic area seems to be a metropolitan area. This offers a better possibility of uncovering more opportunities through more intensive use of time in one area. Here again, an ongoing project where information could be added over a period of years would also seem to provide a good method of acquiring complete information. The Toronto directory offers a good example of an ongoing project.

Long term funding would be most productive and formal evaluation should be built into the plan. Costs can possibly be kept small by having participating organizations and institutions do some of the work, pay some of the costs, or contribute materials or do publicity.

It is generally not practical, however, to charge for the directory

if the purpose is to distribute to a large audience. Dissemination is a problem without making it inaccessible to the poor, and less appealing for others, by charging. If the decision is to produce a small number of complete directories--such as in the Toronto plan--an effort should be made to acquaint the adult population with the availability of the service, and how it can be used.

If a directory now used by helpers were to be adapted for the general public, some changes would be required. The format must be clear and easy to follow. It should be eye appealing and easy to use in pursuing interests by providing telephone numbers or addresses. It also must be well publicized.

Cooperative agencies would want to be sure that the information, geographic area represented, and intended publicity will meet the needs of their particular audience. They should be willing to freely provide information, help and financing or in kind services if they would like to see a directory or information and referral service succeed. They should also be prepared with services for those who respond through the directory. Also, those cooperative agencies have a right to expect periodic evaluation of the services being provided.

Users should be able to expect a directory that is appealing and easy to understand. Institutions listed should respond in a helpful manner. Added services, such as counseling, should be available. The users most of all, should be informed of the service and how to acquire it. They should be able to feel that the directory was directed at them. One thing users should be able to expect is that the service will not disappear in a year, but will continue to improve and provide opportunities for growth.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS--THE PROCESS

Having looked at the twelve directories in detail, it would now be helpful to analyze the process of development. Most of this more detailed information was gained from the telephone interviews. Appendix C lists the names of the individuals interviewed for each directory, so they will not be cited each time here. This chapter will present information on who recognized the need and developed the directory, how financing was acquired, what data were collected, what information was disseminated, and what types of evaluation were performed. Problems will be discussed and conclusions and implications presented.

Recognition of Need and Developer

The need for a directory was seen and acted upon by a variety of institutions and organizations. An examination of the types of organizations that developed directories, and how the directories fit into the organization's functions provides a picture of the variety of institutions that are interested in disseminating information about learning opportunities to adults. (See Table II, p. 21).

Libraries in Toronto and Houston have been involved in developing two directories. The Toronto Library now carries on the project alone, because the Ontario Institute of Adult Education and the Department of Secondary Education had to withdraw from the project because of lack of

funds. The Houston project involved three libraries.

Colleges and Universities were directly involved in six of the twelve directories studied. Kanses State University and the University of Kanses developed the Informal Learning Directory, because they saw a need to publicize and evaluate informal learning. It was realized that there was a wide variety of offerings available in the state, but few people were aware of them. Out of this grew the Wichita Learning Directory which was compiled by an adult education class at Kansas State University.

Colorado State University compiled a catalog for each of the six states in their region. However, there were individuals in each state who sought out and supplied information to the Colorado State project.

Cornell University in New York received a state government grant which led to the development of A Guide to Learning Opportunities for Adults. The first phase of the project involved data gathering. Adults were interviewed concerning their needs and obstacles encountered with the current delivery system. Education and community institutions were questioned about what they were doing, and business and industry were asked to describe community needs. Data for the directory was acquired through this process. The second phase of the project involved policy discussions within the region. These meetings included community leaders and policy makers. It was here the idea of a directory was suggested. The third phase of the project involved training para-professionals to work with adults. It was felt the directory would be too expensive for individuals, and they probably did not need all the information included. Thus, institutions which had provided information for the directory and

were familiar with it, worked with adults seeking information. This included counselors in colleges, parole officers, social workers, and projects with referral services. The people already employed by these types of agencies which might use the directory were given training in its use. A team from Cornell went out into the region to provide training. The people they trained (approximately 120), became known as linkers. They also fed back information as they worked with adults and the directory. In summary, the three phases were--data collection and analysis, directory production, and training to provide access to the educational opportunities identified in the directory.

The directory developed in the Rochester region of New York was done by a consortium of colleges (RAC). It was part of a feasibility study for the development of a coordinated system of post-secondary continuing education in this region.

The directory done in Syracuse by the RLS was indirectly related to a college. The Regional Learning Service is a non-profit education brokering operation. It has a working relationship with the State University of New York. It is a liaison between people interested ineducation and learning institutions or programs. Learning consultants who work part time for the RLS live and work in the immediate area, help make opportunities available, and try to identify barriers to returning adult students. The RLS also provides career and educational counseling services for adults in a five county metropolitan area. Clients may meet on a group or individual basis and pay a minimal fee of $30 for individual help for two months or $20 for group workshops. These workshops are offered in conjunction with agencies in the area and deal with such topics

as job seeking skills and self-awareness. The RLS in New York was a pilot in this field of brokering. It has basically a three-pronged approach providing education counseling, career counseling and job seeking skills. Most clients were between 25 and 45 years of age and two-thirds were women. The information service has helped about 6,000 callers in three years. The most important function of the service was counseling. Serious consideration is now being given to expansion of the information service.

The RLS built on an earlier directory developed by the Metropolitan Syracuse Committee on Continuing Education in 1972-3. In 1975, this committee asked the RLS to update the directory. Thus, the need was originally recognized by an adult education associatinn.

A government agency was the direct sponsor in the case of the Washington, D.C. directory. The work was contracted to a consulting firm. As the firm developed the directory, it also developed a comprehensive mailing list of agencies, institutions and groups who could use the directory.

Adult education associations have played a prominent role in three of the directories studied here. The Central Ohio directory was compiled under the auspices of the Central Ohio Adult Education Association. The idea for the directory grew out of meetings of the association and has been done bi-annually for six years.

The Dutchess Association for Continuing Education (DACE) produces a Round-Up of Courses printed in a newspaper format. In November of 1972 a BOCES[35] employee, who is now director of the DACE project,

---

[35]BOCES are, practically speaking, regional public schools. They were set up through the state department of education. There are 50 in the state. They provide special education for those who need to go out of their own school district to get it, as well as occupational education. They provide half day programs for high school students as well as high school equivalency, ABE, consumer and homemaking programs.

met with public school directors of continuing education and asked them to support the directory effort. Continuing education agencies were asked to join this cooperative effort, since a bulletin was seen as necessary, but no one institution or agency could afford to produce it. In April,1973, the director presented a proposal, with the necessary facts and figures, to this group (DACE), and the bulletin became a reality in the fall. Some members of DACE never attended meetings and only participated in the bulletin production. Conversely, some agencies were too small or too far from population centers to publicize their offerings in the bulletin, but they belonged to and participated in DACE.

In Denver, the Community Information and Resource Center for Lifelong Education (CIRCLE) was a service of the Adult Education Council of Metropolitan Denver. This council was incorporated in 1930 and was an independent, non-profit community resource center for adult education information. It became a non-profit corporation in 1935 and was the only private adult education council in the country. Along with Educational Opportunities, which was published three times a year, the council also produced a monthly calendar of events sponsored by libraries, museums, clubs, and organizations. The council provided the daily paper with a weekly column on free events. It also provided a quarterly Speakers Sampler and an information and referral service center. In the year ending March, 1977, it provided information to over 2,500 people. This service had constantly updated information listed by category, sponsoring organization, or geographic location. The directory examined for this study was actually a large poster with very small print. This poster, entitled Educational Opportunities, was begun in 1950. The interest in

continuing education was so high that every college and university, five or six propriatary schools, community organizations, and businesses were members of CIRCLE. One hundred fifty organizations and 300 individuals belong for a fee of $10 for individuals and $30 for organizations. Members were invited to special events, conferences, and seminars on current topics and public issues. The member organization was listed as a community resource and its programs and special events were listed. Thus, the member organizations received extensive publicity. Because the organizations must be members to be listed in the various publications and were eager for the publicity, membership has remained strong. All of this work was done by two full-time and three part-time employees.

Initial Funding

Government grants were the main source of initial funds for six of the twelve directories. (See Table III, p. 25) In the two cases of the RAC and Cornell directories, the directory was developed as part of an information and referral service or a research project.

Four of the six government funded directories received federal grants. The Kansas directory was funded by the National Institute of Education, through the University of Mid-America, to develop an information and referral service for formal careers and non-formal learning.

The Cornell directory grew out of an initial eighteen month proposal funded by Title I of the Higher Education Act and implemented through the State Department of Education. The purpose of this project was to develop a model for the delivery of continuing education services in the state. This involved data-gathering about what opportunities were available. This data later served as the basis for a directory. The need for a directory was seen after the eighteen month study was evaluated, so

funding was sought and received to cintinue the project for the purpose of developing a directory.

The RAC directory was also funded with Title I monies. Here, the grant was given to study the usefulness of a directory, and the directory developed as part of an action project.

The Colorado State University group of directories were funded by the United States Office of Education (USOE). The proposal to do a state-wide directory for each state in Region VIII was funded for eighteen months. The states were then expected to provide funding for continuation.

The Washington, D.C. directory was funded by Adult Education Act 309 funds which were allocated for such things as teacher training and demonstration projects. This directory was the result of a notice for bids. Projects were evaluated and the consulting firm's proposal for a directory was selected.

One government funded directory was the result of state or provincial funding. In Toronto, funding was originally provided by the provincial government to the sponsors: Toronto Institute of Adult Education, Metropolitan Toronto Library Board and the Department of Secondary Education.

Six directories were funded by agency budgets. The RLS revised an earlier directory prepared by the Metropolitan Syracuse Committee on Continuing Education with agency funds obtained through foundations and federal and state grants. The Houston directory was developed to aid the library referral services, and this directory was funded from the agency's budget.

The CIRCLE directory had a variety of funding sources. The Educational Opportunities was produced by the Community Information and Resource Center for Lifelong Education. This was a service of the Adult Education Council of Metropolitan Denver. The funds for the directory thus came out of this agency's budget which was supplied 70% by membership fees, 10% by foundation grants and 20% by donated services.

The Ohio directory was produced by donated labor from staff members and clerical help at Columbus Technical Institute. In effect, the directory was subsidized by the Institute, since these people produced the directory during normal work hours. The Wichita directory was supported in a similar manner. It was produced by college students who donated time while the college provided for actual expenses incurred. In the case of the DACE directory, the agencies supplying information paid for the directory and computer printout. Total costs per page of the newspaper-type directory were determined. This included the cost of the computer printout. Each institution wrote its copy and paid for the space it used. A public school unit allowed use of its bulk rate mail permit and free computer time to help defray costs.

As has been seen, the process of acquiring funds for these directories was quite varied. Although federal and state government grants have provided much of the funding, the type of grants, agency channels and procedures varied considerably. Cooperation among institutions and donated services by interested persons and agencies were very important for the funding and completion of many of these directories.

Staffing

Inter-agency cooperation was very important in collecting data to include in the directory. During this process many community

groups and institutions were contacted for information on services they provided, as well as knowledge about other learning opportunities in the area.

The data collection was done by graduate students, as part-time employees or interns, in three instances. In other cases such as the libraries, primary work was done by one to three professionals with much clerical support. The amount of time and the number of hours put in by professional and clerical individuals varied a great deal, depending on the size and comprehensiveness of the directory, and whether it was new or only being updated. (See Table V, p. 45). The general time frame was six to nine months to develop a new directory. The total number of hours varied greatly. The Kansas directory required 1,840 hours from two professionals and 160 clerical hours. However, because those were only non-credit learning opportunities, it quite possibly took longer to locate this information. The Houston directory, dealing with only a metropolitan area, took three professionals a total of 200 hours plus an additional 80 clerical hours.

Updating was generally a three-month process. The amount of work done by the compilers again varied because there was a variety of methods used. One approach required the participating institutions to provide the information. Another method was personal updating through telephone calls or letters. For example, when the RLS directory was produced, the old directory was revised by two clerical people who spent 320 hours in contacting the community agencies. The DACE directory was done with 30 hours of professional time. Toronto has developed a very efficient system requiring 10 hours of professional and 280 clerical hours to update its very large and comprehensive directory. This can be

TABLE V

ESTIMATED TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DIRECTORY

Number of Hours By Type of Personnel	Number of Projects Requiring Indicated Hours In Each Personnel Category
Clerical	
-0-	1
1-100 hours	4
100-500 hours	3
1,000+ hours	1
Could Not Estimate	3
Professional	
1-100 hours	2
100-500 hours	4
1,000+ hours	3
Could Not Estimate	3
Volunteer	
-0-	4
1-100 hours	3
100-500 hours	2
Could Not Estimate	3

done in four to five weeks. Here again the participating institutions offering programs and classes did much of the work, which kept the time, and thus, the costs for the producer, at a minimum.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The basic procedure for collecting data for a directory was to contact various community agencies by telephone or personal letter to determine what learning activities were available and the pertinent details. College brochures were also examined. Inquiries were directed to institutions, organizations or individuals involved in continuing education, community education and adult education. Bill Draves, who developed the Kansas directory, found that community colleges did not know about many programs except their own, and that home economists were the best informed. The difficulty in locating learning opportunities in urban areas was shown by the previously mentioned 300 entries identified in the Wichita directory, while there were only forty listings for Wichita in the Kansas State directory.

Toronto provided a good example of the updating process. They sent each institution a listing of its courses, from the previous directory with the subject heading. The institution was asked to update the information, send in a listing of new courses and verify the subject heading. The library, through its computer, then coded the information, checked the dates and put it under the appropriate subject heading. This process was usually done in the summer.

In the case of the DACE directory, the updating process began about three months before publication. By late June, commitments were made by the agencies for the amount of space they wanted. Purchase orders were sent out and a printer procured. Then, the director sent out a

confirmation letter and a copy of the old index printout. By mid-July, the member agencies had returned copy and layout, made corrections in the index, and indicated how they wanted the name of the organization printed. Between late July and early August, each agency was expected to check its proofs at the printer's. In late August, the Bulletins were delivered by the printer to the post office.

Another example was CIRCLE, which sends a letter to the official representatives of each educational institution two months before publication asking for information for the directory. This allowed four weeks lead time to get information. When the information came in, each class was typed on a 3x5 card which was given to the printer.

Unlike Toronto, both the CIRCLE and the DACE directory developers did their work without the aid of a computer. While the telephone was very important in getting information from slow participants, the basic method of updating shown in these directories was by letter.

Cornell looked into developing a computer system. They did get a skeleton developed for a local-level system, but the grant under which they were working did not allow for its development. They saw a computer system set up through the United Way which would help in collecting information. This would be put on a small computer with a telephone referral system. Information could be called in and put on line immediately. The computer could make hard copy for institutions to use in advising adults. The cost of initiating this system was estimated at $30,000, depending on agency support.

Data collection methods varied, but of prime importance was cooperation from participating institutions so that maximum information would be included and work done on time. Despite the differences in

types and amount of content, the collection process took approximately six to nine months for new directories and three months for updating.

Dissemination and Access

Once the money was secured and a directory produced, it had to be made available. The method of distribution and type of access provided was dependent on the intended user of the directory. A look at the distribution process revealed that all directories were distributed to libraries and schools, colleges and universities. (See Table IV, p. 26). Ten of the twelve directories were sent to cooperative extension services and government agencies. Health and welfare agencies, business and industry, and recreation and voluntary agencies received eight of these possible twelve directories. Five or fewer organizations sent directories to Senior Citizen Centers, labor unions, conference centers, or museums and galleries. Professional groups, media and religious institutions received six directories. Six also sent their directories to individuals upon request.

Bill Draves, of Kansas, saw the directory in a progression of information and referral services. The printed directory would be first followed by a telephone system and then a computer system.

Access to the information was provided by information and referral services as well as printed directory in eight cases. (See Table II, p. 21). In four cases the directories were the only means of acquiring the information that had been gathered. It was interesting to note that three of those four directories have not been continued.

Two agencies provided counseling and training for professional users. Telephone answering and referral systems were offered by six agencies. RLS and CIRLCE had long-standing and formal information and referral services. In these cases the directory served as a public relations instrument or public resource for the information and referral

service. In three instances (Kansas, Wichita and Ohio), the telephone service was new, and it was started in conjunction with the directory. Information and referral services were central to the operation of libraries and were not set up in conjunction with the directory project. However, in these cases, the directory aided the depth and breadth of the referrals that library personnel could make. The costs involved in this type of service were very hard to determine, because the information and referral service was usually a part of the ongoing jobs of those involved.

In the case of Cornell, volunteers provided the training for users. They also fed information on needs back to the developers of the directory as part of their ongoing work with adults.

It is easy to see how effective dissemination and easy access made the printed directory more useful. Edwin Hostetter, who developed the DACE directory, and Margaret Van Arnam, a consultant with RLS, felt that computers with telephone referral were the wave of the future. They were seen as the most efficient in the long run, allowing for immediate update and access. The cost of regularly updating a printed directory, and the problems of distribution also make a computer and information and referral system attractive. Another alternative would be a loose-leaf format, so pages could be added and subtracted. This would only work if the directory did not list specific course times and places but was a general resource for listing institutions and programs.

Direct mail was used to publicize ten directories. This meant simply mailing the directory directly to those who had information listed and to other interested parties, as mentioned earlier. Radio, television, brochures, posters and newspapers were also used. (See Table VI, p. 50).

TABLE VI

METHODS OF PUBLICIZING THE PROJECT AND FREQUENCY OF PUBLICITY

Methods to Publicize Directories	Number of Projects Using Each
Direct Mail	10
Radio	5
Brochure	4
Newspaper	4
Poster	3
Television	3
Frequency of Publicity	
Each semester, season, quarter or term	2
Annually	1
One Time	5
Irregularly	4

This was usually done by the sponsors of the directory and sometimes by those using it. For example, a community school listed in the directory might include an article about the directory in its newsletter. Much of the publicity was free as public service announcements or human interest interviews. Thus, it was irregular. Producers who had regular directories, such as Toronto and CIRCLE, also had regular publicity through news releases with each edition. The libraries also had information booths set up in the fall to provide information about the directory and a public introduction with extensive publicity. Houston library had a fair, with those listed in the directory setting up booths about their programs or offerings. The reaction of those who had displays was very positive, and they usually requested to be listed in the directory the next year.

Dissemination and access were seen as an important part of the development process. Although various methods were used, information and referral seemed to be the most popular.

Evaluation

Formal, ongoing evaluation procedures were rare. (See Table VII p. 52). Two directories included an evaluation form. Evaluation seemed to have come from the institutions and agencies who used the directory. The findings were used to make changes in content or format. External evaluation was used in five cases, external and internal in one, and no evaluation was done in six. Kansas had evaluated the information and referral service but not the directory itself.

Informal approaches were used to evaluate. For those directories where participating institutions pay most of the costs or do most of the

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF PROJECTS CONDUCTING AN EVALUATION OF DIRECTORIES

	Number of Projects Involved
Directory Evaluated?	
Yes	5
No	5
In Process	2
By Whom?	
Outside Evaluator	4*
Inside Evaluator	3
How Long After Publication of Directory?	
6 months	2
2 months	1
Ongoing	2
3 years	1
Not stated	1
How Results Were Used:	
For justification of project	4
For changes in project	3
To account for money spent	2
To determine usage	1

*This was usually the user whether helper or learner.

work, a lack of interest would be an indicator of problems with format, content, or general usefulness. In Toronto the library did an evaluation for one borough (of six) to see if there was enough interest to develop a directory for only that borough. Although results were not available, the borough must have found high usage, according to Josephine Tsui, because the library produced two directories for the borough. Requests for copies of the directories were also indicators of value as well as increased calls to information and referral services. However, detailed records of these requests were not available. The linkers used at Cornell to train users also provided evaluation in informal group sessions and through short written forms during the development process. The Cornell directory itself has not yet been evaluated.

Problems

Certainly, there were problems related to the development of these directories. One frequently mentioned problem was the difficulty in locating all of the learning opportunities. Because many institutions and organizations offer these opportunities as a secondary function, little publicity was given to them. The general community was, thus, often unaware of them, and those trying to locate opportunities were often not told about them. When asking individuals in a community about adult learning opportunities, often the most obvious and well-known come to mind and the others are forgotten.

Another concern was the geographic size of the area to be included in a directory. The statewide directories done by Colorado State University were not enthusiastically received, because people felt they needed information about their local community and really

did not have use for it statewide. At Cornell it was determined that a statewide directory would be very useful if broken into local segments, since that was what most institutions found useful.

Colorado also had the problem of coding information from the six states for a computer. Each person collecting data had a different bias, or definition, of what was or was not adult education. Thus, some individuals included courses in life improvement, such as dance and macrame, and others only included ABE, GED, and university programs. The question of education versus therapy also comes into play here. RLS had a related problem in that the RLS and the Adult Education committee had different ideas of what should be included. From this it can be seen that a clear definition of information to be included in the directory was essential.

Distribution can be a problem, especially in a growing population center. Information gathering problems were sometimes accentuated by institutional jealousy. Sometimes organizations or businesses did not want their competitors to know what they would be doing, and thus did not share information in the directory. Also, they may not want the directory producers to publicize what their competitors were doing, and thus may not make a referral. Also, some organizations and institutions were not very aware of what other things were going on in the community.

Other data gathering problems were getting questionnaires returned and finding the appropriate person to talk to when making a telephone call.

Major organizational problems that were identified were the questions of how to proceed, and how much time and money would be required.

Many directories were not available to the general public because

of the cost, because of the feeling that they would not be useful without help in explaining then, or because the agency that produced it could not have handled the volume of possible responses. Thus, some of those interviewed questioned how aware the general public was of the directory and hence how much use had really been made of it.

Some institutions viewed placement in the directory as good publicity. Many of the programs listed were large, and depending on the format of the directory, the entries had to be condensed and detailed information had to be omitted. This question of how much information to include can be a dilemma. For purposes of an information and referral service, detailed information was required. This of course, increased the cost. The general public, too, may be more attracted by specific information on time and place. The counselor, however, may only need the short description and a telephone number. Thus, the intended user was a very important consideration, as has already been mentioned.

Human error in production was also of concern to those developing directories. Clean copy and being sure everyone was included were major considerations.

Other problems were increases in costs after participants' contributions have been determined or the difficulties in obtaining agreement on format or content among various groups in a cooperative effort.

Conclusions

Libraries, colleges or universities and adult education associations were responsible for the development of the directories studies here.

Government grants were an important source of funding for the directories. Agencies already involved with adult learning were also a prominent source of funds. Cooperation among agencies and institutions was very important for completion of directories.

Data collection was done by students, professional or clerical people. The number of hours varied, but generally it took from six to nine months to produce a new directory and about three months for updating an existing directory.

Telephone and personal contact were important when beginning a directory. Letters were often used to collect updating information. Once a working relationship was established, contact by letter was sufficient to keep it functioning.

Additional services to enhance access to information were provided in the majority of cases. Three of the four directories that had no additional services to users were not continued. They may have been discontinued because of a lack of easy access which may have resulted in poor usage. Or conversely, time and money were not spent on access, because it was not seen as worthwhile for a short-term funded project.

Long term funding was a pressing problem. To acquire continuing support for a directory, the community of providers and users must be convinced of its usefulness. This may very well be related to services provided in addition to the directory. For example, if information and referral services were included, the directory would be more readily usable and thus, potential sponsors would see a wider public use of the directory. The Colorado, RAC and D.C. directories offered no attendant services and did not survive beyond the pilot period. Other factors

were certainly involved. In Colorado, the information was listed for the total state and considered too wide-spread to be useful. The RAC directory (a regional effort) was not funded beyond the pilot period because a library had a county-by-county computer system which proved more useful. In Washington, D.C., the directory was produced by a private consulting firm and funded under a demonstration project grant, and no one picked it up to continue.

Telephone information and referral services were the most common access methods for these directories.

The results of the interviews imply that computer systems may make printed directories obsolete.

Most of the directories studied here were widely distributed, but publicity was sporadic because the directory was a one-time demonstration project, or because the publicity was free and therefore not controlled by the directory developers.

Evaluation tended to be informal or nonexistent. Formal evaluation was evidently not a top priority for those who have developed directories. The informal type that was done was often used to alter format and make the content more useful.

Problems relating to development usually centered around a lack of definition of purpose and user, and a lack of cooperation among agencies. If those collecting information had been clear on what information they were seeking, and who needed it, many problems would have been avoided. Likewise, a spirit of community cooperation would help data gathering and dissemination.

Recommendations and Implications

For someone planning to develop a directory, the first step would be to determine if someone else in the community had made a similar attempt. If they had, the developer would obviously want to contact them and gain their help and insight. If not, the next step would be to gain the cooperation of possible participants in the project. This could be done by seeking out programs or organizations which served to coordinate the efforts of a variety of institutions or agencies. Gaining the cooperation and help of these programs or organizations would be very valuable in acquiring initial support, funding, information sources, dissemination points, and publicity. Having gained the support of some of the institutions or organizations involved, funding could then be sought from any of the previously mentioned sources.

A common and inexpensive method of gathering and compiling data was the use of graduate students. Colleges have ready access to this resource. Internships might be arranged with a local college if the group doing the project were not affiliated with a higher education institution. Another common and less expensive practice was to have clerical people do most of the work. Of course, a computer would be ideal, and arrangement through cooperating institutions or businesses could possibly be made to get free or low-cost computer time.

When compiling information, it would be most helpful to consult with knowledgable adult educators. One respondent cited the county extension home economist who was viewed as having extensive knowledge about community activities in rural areas.

Clear definitions of what is to be included, and who are the intended user(s), are essential if more than one individual or institution

is gathering data. Frustrations would run high if one group spent many hours gathering information that the others thought was not appropriate.

Access to the information through a telephone system was an efficient and effective means of supplying the information to a large public. The cost of direct mail to every home was often prohibitive. DACE was the only one who did this and the publication was a newspaper format with postage subsidized by a public agency. It is necessary to have broad media coverage if a telephone system is used, so the public is made aware of the service and obtains ready access to the service. Publicity is a critical link in the use of the directory and/or its service. Good publicity can result in high usage, community support and finally, funding.

If the purpose of the directory is to help social service agencies and others who work with adults, a telephone information and referral service may not be necessary, but training may be recommended for those who would use the directory. If dissemination was through existing agencies, a list of interested and related organizations would have to be developed for the community. This, too, could be done by clerical people if such a list did not exist.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

Adult learners are often seeking opportunities for gaining knowledge. A comprehensive directory of learning opportunities could provide these learners, or someone helping them, with the necessary information about available programs in a wide variety of institutions in a given community. Such a directory would also provide publicity for the institutions providing educational programs for adults.

Because of the proliferation in learning programs for adults and the recognition of adult learning styles, more communities are seeing a need for an information service that could be fulfilled by such a directory. However, at the present time, there is no information available on how to develop such a directory or on what it should contain.

This study has attempted to contribute to our knowledge of community directories of adult learning opportunities by selecting representative directories, and describing what they are like and how they were developed.

An initial mailed survey covered every state, and other information was gathered by personal interviews, questionnaires and telephone calls. Twelve directories were studied in detail. Questions were asked about intended user, the purpose, format, distribution, publicity, attendant services and methods of financing. The following conclusions were drawn:

1) Distinctions based on intended user and purpose are important in the first steps of development, because they affect so much of the content of the directory.

2) The most useful directory deals with a limited geographic area, probably a metropolitan area.

3) Staff time and printing were generally the highest costs, along with telephone and computer if they were used.

4) Directories can be done on a small budget with inter-agency cooperation and contributions of services.

5) Evaluation has been used primarily to alter format.

6) Computers and information and referral services were sometimes seen as the final phase of a learning service, with the directory serving as a step toward a non-print information and referral service.

With these conclusions in mind, the following recommendations for developers are made:

1) Define who will be the intended user--adult learners or agency staff members (helpers).

2) Keep the geographic area small, i.e., a metropolitan area.

3) Determine the users' needs and provide content to meet them.

4) Consider a computer and/or information and referral service to supplement a printed directory.

5) Seek a variety of funding sources--particularly long term.

6) Recognize the value of cost sharing by participating organizations and institutions.

7) Define the role of cooperating agencies and develop an understanding of their role(s).

8) Match distribution, numbers printed, and publicity type to audience type and size.

9) Provide services to improve access to and use of the system.

10) Keep in mind that the usefulness of the directory is crucial to its continuation.

After looking at the directories themselves, the process of developing a community-wide directory of adult learning opportunities was explored, including data collection, financing, dissemination, access and evaluation. Problems were again explored and these conclusions reached:

1) Directories have been developed by a variety of groups or institutions--colleges and universities, adult education associations, and libraries. Information and referral services and consulting firms have also played a role.

2) Funding sources were mainly government and participating agencies. Secondary sources of funds and support were foundations, institutions, membership fees, volunteers or a combination of the above.

3) The data gathering process for a new directory takes from six to nine months depending on the size of the geographic area and comprehensiveness of content.

4) Updating of an existing directory usually takes about three months.

5) Providing adequate publicity is often difficult, but can attract participants with the promise of a wider public knowledge of an agency's services.

6) Services to provide easy access to the information in the directory is very important.

7) Problems related to development centered around confusion about the user of the directory and/or the purpose,and obtaining cooperation among agencies.

8) Evaluation is mostly informal and internal.

These conclusions resulted in the following recommendations for those developing a directory:

1) They need to first determine if anyone had attempted a directory in the community.

2) Then, they should work on developing cooperation among possible participants.

3) It would be necessary in this process to clearly define what is to be included in the directory.

4) Finding an inexpensive way to gather data--students, volunteers, or clerical people is also important. Local adult educators would be an excellent resource here.

5) The developers should determine the type of access for user, (information and referral by telephone seems most effective) and distribution method.

6) Methods of providing adequate publicity should be determined so the user is aware of the service. This can be made easier if there is interagency cooperation.

It must be kept in mind that the purpose of this study was to find, select and analyze a small group of written directories. While attendant services, such as information and referral, play an important part in the development and use of many of these directories, it was not the intent of this study to explore those services in depth. However,

they would offer interesting material for study, since they provide the learner easy access to a wealth of information.

Although the sample represented here was small, a variety of community directories of adult learning opportunities was analyzed. Hopefully, anyone developing such a directory will find these recommendations on content and process useful and thus develop a more effective resource for the benefit of their whole community.

APPENDIX A

Sharon Slettehaugh
2307 Arthur St. N.E.
Mpls., MN 55418

August 10,1977

I am a graduate student in Adult Education at the University of Minnesota and am compiling a report on the development of directories of adult education opportunities. This report could provide useful information for others attempting to develop them. Having looked at many directories, I have found yours to be one of fourteen which are excellent examples of comprehensive community directories and would provide good models for others.

Some of the information I need to compile for this paper will come from your response to the enclosed questionnaire. It will take you about ten to fifteen minutes to answer it. A personal telephone conversation will be necessary to obtain the unique input that only you can provide. I would like an opportunity to call you at your convenience and discuss the details of your project. Enclosed you will find questions I would like to pursue at that time. Please indicate on the last page of the questionnaire times most convenient for you.

If you are interested, I will be most happy to send you the results of my work. After I have compiled the results, I will attempt to make them available to communities or institutions interested in developing similar resources. In this way, your pioneering efforts can be helpful to others trying to develop similar directories.

The University requires that all research comply with the human subjects in research requirements. Therefore, I need your signature under the consent statement to show that I have your permission to use the data you provide.

If you have any questions, please write me at the above address or telephone 612/789-1984 in the evening or 612/338-0721 during the day.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Sharon Slettehaugh

ADULT EDUCATION DIRECTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Description of area served by your directory (please check one).

___ Region

___ State

___ County

___ Metropolitan area

___ One city

___ Neighborhood within a city

Approximate population of service area: _____

2. Purpose of your directory (please check all that apply).

___ Provide an information resource for adult learners (including Self-Directed Learners)

___ Provide an information resource to professional people advising adult learners

___ Provide an information resource for agency personnel planning adult education programs

___ Help in recruitment for adult education

___ Promote the idea of lifelong learning

___ Develop public understanding of the scope of educational opportunities for adults

___ Fulfills the stated purpose of our agency

___ Other. Please specify_____

_____

3. Type of information included in the directory. (Please check all that apply).

___ Agency offering the activity

___ Title of activity

___ Times

___ Places

___ Fees

___ Instructor

___ Objectives

___ Description

___ Prerequisites

___ Method (e.g., class, lecture series, workshop, etc.)

4. Types of learning activities included:

___ Credit courses

___ Non-credit courses, workshops, etc.

5. How many different people were involved in the preparation of your FIRST directory?

	Number of Individuals	Total Estimated Number of Hours
Professional		
Clerical		
Volunteers		
Others: (give examples)		
Others:		

6. To whom did you disseminate your directory? (Check all that apply)

___ Libraries

___ Schools, colleges, and universities

___ Labor unions

___ Cooperative extension services

___ Government

___ Professional groups

___ Conference centers

___ Media

___ Museums and galleries

___ Religious institutions

___ Health and welfare agencies

___ Businesses and industry

___ Senior Citizen centers and groups

___ Voluntary agencies

___ Recreation agencies

___ Other _____

_____

_____

7. How did you provide access to your information? (Please check all that apply).

___ Trainer for users

___ Clearinghouse

___ Personal educational counseling

___ Printed directories

___ Telephone answering and referral system

___ Cable TV

___ Computer

8. How many different people were involved in preparation and maintenance of the access services indicated in question #7?

	Number of Individuals	Total Estimated Number of Hours
Professional		
Clerical		
Volunteers		
Others: (give example)		
Others:		

9. How did you publicize your directory and/or service? (Please check all that apply).

Media:

___ Radio

___ TV

___ Brochure

___ Poster

___ Direct mail

Publicity prepared by: (Check all that apply)

___ Commercial agency

___ Institution(s) offering the activities

___ Sponsor(s) of the Directory

___ Institutions using the Directory and/or services

How often publicized:

___ One time

___ Annually

___ Each semester, quarter, season or term

___ Irregularly

10. Financial information

Number of copies of directory in first printing _____

Number of copies of directory in most recent printing _____

Sold: First ___ Yes ___ No

Most recent ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, cost per copy _____ First _____Most recent

EXPENDITURES FOR TOTAL PROJECT INCLUDING ACCESS:

	Annual Continuing Costs in Dollars	Start-up Costs (1st production or product) in dollars
Staff		
Consultants		
Printing		
Facilities		
Distribution		
Publicity		
Computer		
Telephone		
TV		
Travel		
Other office costs, (supplies,etc.)		
Other (please specify)		
Other:		

10 (cont.)

INCOME: Please give percentages or dollar figures whichever are most convenient for most recent directory.

_____ Government grants

_____ Donated by the public

_____ Foundation grants

_____ User fees or sales

_____ Donated Services: Business and Agencies

_____ Donated Services: Individuals

_____ Agency budgets

11. Evaluation:

Have you evaluated your project? ___ Yes ___ No ___ In process

Who did the evaluation? ___ Staff person ___ Outside evaluator

How long after publication of first directory was the evaluation done?

___ Six months ___ One year

___ Other. Please specify _____

How were results used?

___ Changes in project

___ Justification of project

___ Budget requests

___ Accounting for money spent

___ Other: Please specify _____

_____

12. PLEASE SEND ANY EVALUATION FORMS, STUDY OF USER CHARACTERISTICS OR OTHER TYPES OF QUESTIONNAIRES THAT WERE USED IN DEVELOPING THE DIRECTORY OR IN EVALUATION OR COMMUNICATION.

I would like to telephone you personally to get more information about the process you used. The questions to be asked at that time are attached. Please tell me how and when I could reach you in the months of August or September.

Telephone number: Area Code _____/_____

Preferred dates: _____

Time of day: _____

CONSENT

(To comply with the human subjects in research law)

Because it may be appropriate to cite your work specifically in the report and appendix, I would like your signature below to show that I have your permission to do so. This report will be disseminated to educators and institutions upon request and may be made available through a clearinghouse or ERIC.

Signature _____ Date _____

Thank you for your help.

PLEASE RETURN TO:

Sharon Slettehaugh
2307 Arthur St. N.E.
Mpls., MN 55418

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Please describe in chronological order the steps taken to develop your directory and how you performed at each step. (e.g., How did you assess needs? Develop and maintain contact with institutions? Develop cooperation? Compile data?).

2. It would also be helpful if you could provide an estimate of the time it took from initiation to conclusion of your project.

3. In conjunction with the above, what kinds of problems did you encounter at each step and how did you deal with them. Were you successful? Would you do it differently next time? If so, how?

4. Did your publicity work? What revision did you make or would you make next time?

5. How did you disseminate your directory?

6. Was dissemination adequate to serve the population? What would you change?

7. Do you update your directory? How and when? Problems? How have you handled them?

8. How did you evaluate? Process and results.

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Committee on the Use of Human
Subjects in Research
2642 University Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55114
(612) 373-9895

7 July 1977

Sharon Slettehaugh
2307 Arthur St. N.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55418

Re: "A Study of the Process of Developing Comprehensive Adult Education Directories"

Dear Ms. Slettehaugh:

The Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research approved the referenced proposal at its meeting of 6 July 1977.

I would like to remind you that it is the responsibility of the principal investigator to bring to the attention of the committee any proposed changes in project or activity plans or any emergent problems that will affect human subjects.

The Committee wishes you every success with this research.

Sincerely,

Diane M. Johnson

Diane M. Johnson
Executive Secretary to the
Committee on the Use of Human
Subjects in Research

DMJ/ehs

APPENDIX C

DIRECTORIES LISTED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENT AND INTERVIEWEE

Reference Name	Questionnaire Respondent and Interviewee	Title of Directory
Kansas State	William A. Draves Director of Free University Manhattan, Kansas	Kansas Informal Learning Directory
Colorado	Douglas Sjogren Professor of Education Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado	Catalog of Adult Education Programs
Cornell	Helen C. Veres Project Director Institute of Occupational Education Cornell University Ithaca, New York	Directory of Continuing Education in Central New York State
Rochester Area Colleges (RAC)	Dr. Alexander R. Cameron Executive Director Education Services Directory Rochester Area Colleges Rochester, New York	Educational Services Directory
Dutchess Assoc. for Conintuine Educ. (DACE)	J. Edwin Hostetter Coordinator of Adult Occupational Educ. Dutchess County Board of Cooperative Education Services Poughkeepsie, New York	DACE Round-Up of Courses
Ohio	Questionnaire: Carol Fought Director, Continuing Education Division Columbus Technical Institute Interview: Wynn Weiss Director, Public Services Technologies Division Columbus Technical Institute Columbus, Ohio	Directory of Adult Education Programs in Central Ohio
Community Infor. & Resour. Center for Lifelong Lrng. (CIRCLE)	Questionnaire: Bette J. Overfield Executive Director Interview: Terence J. Matheny Program Coordinator CIRCLE Denver, Colorado	Educational Opportunities

Reference Name	Questionnaire Respondent and Interviewee	Title of Directory
Houston	Questionnaire: Mary L. Meyers, Deborah C. Dougan and Cindy Ecklund Librarians Interview: Mary L. Meyers, Librarian Houston Public Libraries Houston, Texas	Learning How
Regional Learning Service (RLS)	Margaret J. Van Arnam Learning Consultant Regional Learning Service Syracuse, New York	Directory of Continuing Education Opportunities in New York City
Toronto	Josephine Tsui Project Librarian Metropolitan Toronto Library Board Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Continuing Education Directory
Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire: Mary G. Turner Assistant Superintendant Division of Adult and Continuing Educ. Interview: Mr. Marcus Division of Adult and Continuing Educ. Washington Public Schools Washington, D.C.	For Adults Only!
Wichita	William A. Draves Director of Free University Manhattan, Kansas	Wichita Informal Learning Directory

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adult Education Council of Metropolitan Denver. Educational Opportunities. Denver: Adult Education Council of Metropolitan Denver, 1977.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Older Americans And Community Colleges: An Overview. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

Anne Arundel Community College. Anne Arundel County Adult Education Directory 1977. Arnold, Maryland: Anne Arundel Community College, 1977.

Anne Arundel Community College. Continuing Education, Spring 1977. Arnold, Maryland: Anne Arundel Community College, 1977.

Brown, Terry, P. "In Chicago, It's Easy to Find Someone to Teach Lion Taming or Anything Else." The Wall Street Journal. April 10, 1973.

Byrd, Phyllis F. "Dial Systems Initiated in Virginia". Adult Leadership. 21:122-3. October, 1972.

Cameron, Alexander R. Rochester Area Colleges, Rochester , New York. Interview, August, 1977.

Carmichael, Mary Margaret, ed. A Guide to Learning Opportunities for Adults: Directory of Continuing Education in Central New York. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1976.

Carmichael, Mary Margaret. Directory of Adult Learning and Counseling in Central New York. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1977.

Central Ohio Adult Education Association. Directory of Adult Education Programs in Central Ohio. Columbus: Central Ohio Adult Education Association, 1974.

Colorado Department of Education. Catalog of Adult Education Programs-Colorado. Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1975.

Colorado Department of Education. Catalog of Adult Education Programs-North Dakota. Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1975.

Colorado Department of Education. Catalog of Adult Education Programs-South Dakota. Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1975.

Cross, Wilbur. The Weekend Education Source Book. New York: Harper's Magazine Press, 1976.

Croteau, S. "You Call Us, They'll Call You: Learning Exchange." Education Digest. 42:16-18. April, 1977.

De Crow, Roger. Information Resources and Services. Edited by Robert Smith. Handbook of Adult Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1970.

Division of Adult and Continuing Education. For Adults Only! A Directory of Programs and Services for Adults. Washington, D.C.: Division of Adult and Continuing Education. 1976.

Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education--Dade County. The Reporter For Adult Education. Dade County: Florida Public Schools, 1971.

Dougan, Deborah; Ecklund, Cindy; and Meyers, Mary. Learning How: A A Guide To Leisure Classes in the Houston Area. Houston: Houston Public Library, 1976.

Draves, William A. The Kansas Informal Learning Directory. Manhattan: Kansas Division of Continuing Education. University of Kansas and Kansas State University, 1977.

Draves, William A. Wichita Informal Learning Directory. Manhattan: Kansas State University, 1977.

Draves, William A. Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. Interview August, 1977.

Dutchess Association for Continuing Education. DACE Round-Up of Courses--Spring, 1977. New York: Dutchess Association of Continuing Education, 1977.

"A Fair Exchange." Time. April 28, 1975.

Fisher, Dennis. "How 'Learning Exchange' Works--at $27 for 6 Months." Chicago Sun-Times. November 9, 1971.

Grabowski, Stanley. "ERIC-Role of the Computer in Adult Education." Adult Leadership. 21:178. November, 1972.

Heffernan, James M.; Macy, Francis U.; and Vickers, Donn F. Educational Brokering, A New Service for Adult Learners. Syracuse: National Center for Educational Brokering, 1976.

Hostetter, J. Edwin. Dutchess County Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Poughkeepsie, New York. Interview, August, 1977.

Illinois Office of Education. Abstracts of Special Demonstration 309 Projects. Springfield: Adult and Continuing Education Section, 1977.

Information and Referral Service of Los Angeles County, Inc. Instant Info--A Brief Community Referral Guide To Services, To Directories. Los Angeles: Information and Referral Service of Los Angeles County, Inc., 1973.

Kay, Evelyn. Adult Education in Community Organizations, 1972. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Kordalewski, Jean B. and Alampreses-Johnson, Judith. Impacts of Services 1974-1977. Syracuse: Regional Learning Service of Central New York.

Lenz, Elinor. "Continuing Education Goes to Market." Adult Leadership. 24:163-4. January, 1976.

Lewis, G. Robert, and Kimishi, Diane Reiku. The Learning Exchange. Evanston: The Learning Exchange, 1977.

Little, Paul L. and Gilliland, Richard. "OASES: Public Library/Community College Partnership." Community and Junior College Journal. 48:14-15. October, 1977.

Lopez, Lois. Education Directory. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Marcus, ____. Washington Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Interview, September, 1977.

Marriott, Geraldine, ed. Educational Services Directory, 1974-75. Rochester, New York: Rochester Area Colleges, 1974.

Maryland Council for Higher Education. State Directory of Public and Private Post-Secondary Education Institutions and Agencies in Maryland. Annapolis: Maryland Council for Higher Education, 1974.

Matheny, Terence J. CIRCLE, Denver, Colorado. Interview, September, 1977.

Metropolitan Toronto Library Board. Continuing Education. Toronto: Metropolitan Toronto Library Board, 1969.

Metropolitan Toronto Library Board. Continuing Education. Toronto: Metropolitan Toronto Library Board, 1973.

Metropolitan Toronto Library Board. Continuing Education in Action--Toronto's Computer-Based Data Bank Serves Wide Public. Toronto: Metopolitan Toronto Library Board, 1970.

Meyers, Mary L. Houston Public Libraries, Houston, Texas. Interview, August, 1977.

New York State Education Department. Directory of Public School Continuing Education Programs in New York State. New York: New York State Education Department, 1975.

Newlin, Joseph. "Communi-Link, A Unique Approach Toward Adult Education Programming." Adult Leadership. 21:263-4. Fall, 1973.

Osso, Nicholas A., Okes, Imogene E. Adult Education in Public School Systems, 1968-69 and 1969-70. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

"The People-To-People System.". Psychology Today. Vol.8, No. 9. February, 1975.

Regional Center for Life-Long Learning. Directory of Continuing Education Opportunities in New York City. New York: Regional Center for Life-Long Learning, 1974.

Regional Learning Service of Central New York. Directory of Adult and Continuing Education Agencies, Metropolitan Syracuse, 1975-76. Syracuse: Regional Learning Service of Central New York, 1975.

Roper, James E. "Three Ways to Get Something Done," Reader's Digest. August, 1972.

Sjogren, Douglas. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado. Interview, August, 1977.

Sjogren, Douglas, and Jacobson, Larry. Cataloging Adult Education Programs in Region VIII and In-Depth Study of Selected Exemplar Programs. Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1976.

Sjogren, Douglas and Jacobson, Larry. Effective A.B.E. Programming: Nine Case Studies. Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1976.

Smith, Davidand Gillespie, Margaret. Hennepin County Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Interview, April, 1977.

Star-Gazette. Adult Continuing Education Opportunities. New York: Star Gazette, 1971.

Texas Education Association. A Statewide Model Referral Guide for Use in Adult Education Programs. Dallas: Texas Education Association, 1975, 1977.

Tough, Allen. The Adult's Learning Projects. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.

Tsui, Josephine. Metropolitan Toronto Library Board, Toronto, Canada. Interview, August, 1977.

University of Minnesota. Directory of Learning Opportunities for Older Adults. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Van Arnam, Margaret J. Regional Learning Service, Syracuse, New York. Interview, August, 1977.

Veres, Helen C. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Interview August, 1977.

Weiss, Wynn. Columbus Technical Institute, Columbus,Ohio. Interview. August, 1977.

"What Is the Next Thing I Want To Do With My Life?" Carnegie Quarterly. Spring, 1977.

Wisby, Gary; "The Learning Exchange--Matching Students to Teachers." Chicago Sunday Sun-Times. November 30, 1975.